REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action mailed July 26, 2005 does not enclose any signed PTO Form-1449. Applicant respectfully requested that the initialed PTO Form-1449 in response to the IDS filed on May 28, 2004 be returned. Further, if this IDS has not been considered, appropriate consideration thereof is also respectfully requested.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 3, and 11 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 2, and 3.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-3 and 11 have been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention recited. These amendments are fully supported by, for example, the original claims and Fig. 6. No new matter has been added.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,285,425 ("Akins et al."). Claims 1-3 and 11 have been amended in this Reply to clarify the present invention recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a structure of a reflector using for a display device such as a liquid crystal display device. As shown in, for example, Figs. 1 and 2, a

reflector 1 of the present invention includes a plurality of unit reflecting portions A each having a reflection face B. It is noted that, as shown in, for example, Fig. 6, the plurality of unit reflecting portions A are *irregularly* configured under the following condition: an inter-tangential plane distance $dP \geq Lc/2$ (where Lc is a coherent length of incident light on the unit reflecting portion).

In this case, the inter-tangential plane distance dP is, as shown in Fig. 3A, defined as a distance between a first tangential plane 7 tangent to a first reflection face B1 arranged in a-first unit reflecting portion A1 at a reference point 6 on the first reflection face B1, and a second tangential plane 8 in parallel with the first tangential plane 7 and tangent to a second reflection face B2 arranged in a second unit reflecting portion A2 adjacent to the first unit reflecting portion A1. In other words, the adjacent unit reflecting portions are configured in different, for example, relative positions, and shapes and sizes thereof under the above condition. *See* also paragraph 0057 of the specification.

In view of the above, claim 1 includes a limitation of "the plurality of unit reflecting portions are irregularly configured under a condition that a distance between a first tangential plane tangent to a first reflection face arranged in a first unit reflecting portion at a reference point on said first reflection face, and a second tangential plane in parallel with said first tangential plane and tangent to a second reflection face arranged in a second unit reflecting portion adjacent to said first unit reflecting portion is half or more of a coherent length of the incident light."

Akins et al., in contrast, fails to show or suggest at least the above limitation as recited in claim 1. Akins et al. simply discloses a ridged reflector having ridges spaced apart by a predetermined pitch. Specifically, Akins et al. is completely silent with respect to a distance

defined by a coherent length of incident light on a reflective layer 68. As noted by the Examiner, Akins et al. discloses a pitch length 62 shown in Fig. 4 of a range between 5 and 10 per millimeters. Akins et al., however, does not disclose a pitch length whatsoever defined by a coherent length of incident light 64.

Further, ridges (which is referred by, for example, numeral 232 of Fig. 7) of Akins et al. are *regularly* arranged at a pitch length. There exists nothing in Akins et al. which shows or suggests that the ridges are configured to be different from each other in pitch lengths. In addition, Akins et al. does not allow for preventing light interference by different configurations of adjacent ridges. Akins et al. plainly states that "[t]he first faces 242 [of ridges 232] are preferably substantially parallel to each other. ... The corresponding first normals of adjacent ones of the first faces 242 are preferably substantially parallel to one another." *See,* for example, col. 12, lines 14-29. Thus, Akins et al. fails to show or suggest the plurality of unit reflecting portions as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Akins et al. fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 2, 3, and 11 also have similar limitations to claim 1. Thus, claims 1-3 and 11 as amended are patentable over Saito. Dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,285,425 ("Atkins et al."). Claim 3, which is referred by claim 5, has been amended in this Reply to clarify the present invention recited. As mentioned above, in view of lack of disclosure

of the plurality of unit reflecting portions *irregularly* configured under the condition of the inter-tangential plane distance dP, Akins et al. does not anticipate or render claim 3 obvious. Thus, claim 3 is patentable over Akins et al. Dependent claim 5 is also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115.107001).

Dated: October 26, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant